

Frank Wernette

From: Pete Rawlings [PeteR@jsanet.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 1999 7:56 AM
To: aitchid@hdcdojnet.state.ca.us; SCANTREL@hq.dfg.ca.gov; michael_fris@mail.fws.gov; Karl.Halupka@noaa.gov; mkie@water.ca.gov
Cc: PaulC@jsanet.com; SeleneJ@jsanet.com
Subject: Testing the ASIP process -Reply

ASIP Team RE: Potential ERP Test ASIP Actions

I would like to throw out another possible ERP Stage 1 action (as being considered as of the Feb. 1999 draft ERP) for consideration:

- Restore tidal wetlands in Suisun Marsh and Van Sickle Island (pg. 145 Vol. 2). [Please note that although the Stage 1 action statement reads "restore tidal wetlands", I believe it is intended to restore shallow-water tidal perennial aquatic habitat since the action is placed under restoration of aquatic habitat in the ERP].

Assuming our objective is to identify a single ERP action that is doable and serves to "buffer" potential effects of South Delta projects on delta smelt, I think appropriate next steps might be to:

1. Agree on a shortened list of potential candidates using the following criteria (assumes primary objective is to help reduce potential adverse effects of South Delta actions on delta smelt):

- o rank potential actions based on their relative ability to "buffer" the most critical anticipated potential adverse effects of South Delta actions on delta smelt;

- o the degree of certainty that delta smelt will respond positively to implementing an action (i.e., rank from least experimental action to most experimental action relative to certainty of project success);

- o rank actions based on the period between when a restoration action is implemented and when restoration associated with the action could be expected to develop sufficiently to elicit a positive response from smelt; and

- o the degree to which an action will achieve multiple ERP and MSCS species objectives.

2. Meet with the ERP team to identify actions that could be feasibly implemented shortly after issuance of the ROD (e.g., sufficient funding would be available, lands for restoration in locations critical to the species are readily available) and to select a final action for consideration in the ASIP.

3. Collect existing info related to a project description that may have been collected by the ERP team for use in developing ERP actions and meet with the ERP team to flesh out additional project description details to a level that will allow development of an ASIP.

Let me know your thoughts.

Also, would it be useful to the team at this point if I were to prepare a list of the ERP actions evaluated in the MSCS that serve as the "umbrella" for each of the potential Stage 1 actions identified by Karl? Again, let me know your thoughts.

Thanks,
Pete

>>> Karl Halupka <Karl.Halupka@noaa.gov> 06/23/99 07:22pm >>>

Everyone,

Attached are two files;

- 1 -- a project description for the Tracy Fish Test Facility, and
- 2 -- a list of suggested ERP actions that could be used in the paired test of the ASIP process we discussed at our last meeting.

The Tracy description is drawn from USBR's Category III proposal and information on their web site (a formal project description from the project manager hasn't arrived yet). The description I compiled is likely to be both too vague and too detailed, but I kept the detail in the "preliminary design criteria" because I thought the headings could help us keep in mind all the different aspects of this seemingly simple project that need to be considered in the ASIP development process.

The ERP action list needs little explanation, but I should point out that these suggestions are mine alone and are presented to get discussion going.

Sorry this took so long to get out.
Karl